



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,340	07/24/2003	Heng Chu	RSW920030074US1	9120
43168	7590	06/25/2009	EXAMINER	
MARCIA L. DOUBET LAW FIRM PO BOX 422859 KISSIMMEE, FL 34742			LOVEL, KIMBERLY M	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2167				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/25/2009		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mld@mindspring.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/626,340	CHU ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	KIMBERLY LOVEL	2167	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 March 2009.

2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 20 and 32-41 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 20 and 32-41 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This communication is in response to the Amendment filed 30 March 2009.
2. Claims 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 20 and 31-41 are currently pending and claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 14-19 and 21-30 are canceled. In the Amendment filed 30 March 2009, claim 29 is amended and claims 34-41 are new. This action is made Final.
3. The previous prior art rejections of claims 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 20 and 31-41 are maintained.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. **Claims 21-26** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.
6. **Claim 36** is directed towards a system. However, it is noted that the use of the word "system" does not inherently mean that the claim is directed towards a machine or article of manufacture. The system comprises of a parser and instructions, both which are interpreted as being software *per se*. Therefore, the claim language fails to provide the necessary hardware required for the claim to fall within the statutory category of a system.

According to MPEP 2106:

The claims lack the necessary physical articles or objects to constitute a machine or a

manufacture within the meaning of 35 USC 101. They are clearly not a series of steps or acts to be a process nor are they a combination of chemical compounds to be a composition of matter. As such, they fail to fall within a statutory category. They are, at best, functional descriptive material *per se*.

Since **claims 37 and 38** are dependent on claim 36 and fail to overcome the deficiencies of claim 36, the claims are rejected on the same grounds as claim 36.

7. To allow for compact prosecution, the examiner will apply prior art to these claims as best understood, with the assumption that applicant will amend to overcome the stated 101 rejections.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claims 3-5, 7-9, 11-13, 20 and 31-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No 7,065,742 to Bogdan (hereafter Bogdan) in view of US PGPub 2005/0149847 to Chandler (hereafter Chandler) in view of US Patent No 7,458,082 to Slaughter et al (hereafter Slaughter).**

Referring to claim 3, the combination Chandler and Bogdan and Slaughter (hereafter Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter) discloses the method according to Claim 32, wherein the input document is a structured document [XML document] (Chandler: see [0038], lines 1-2).

**Referring to claim 4**, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the method according to Claim 3, wherein the structured document is encoded in Extensible Markup Language ("XML") (Chandler: see [0038], lines 1-2).

**Referring to claim 5**, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the method according to Claim 32, wherein the generated output comprises at least one object representation generated from the input document (Bogdan: see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44).

**Referring to claim 7**, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the method according to Claim 33, wherein the second syntax level schema definition is requested by specifying a schema name of the second schema definition, to which the generated output must adhere (Chandler: see [0038], lines 15-19).

**Referring to claim 8**, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the method according to Claim 33, wherein the second syntax level schema definition is requested by specifying a schema name of the second schema definition, indicating that the second schema definition is to be used by the validating parser when generating the output (Chandler: see [0038], lines 15-19).

**Referring to claim 9**, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the method according to Claim 8, wherein the schema name is specified, by the application program, as a feature on an invocation of the validating parser (Chandler: see [0038]).

**Referring to claim 11**, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the method according to Claim 32, wherein the identification of the first schema definition in the

input document comprises a specification, in the syntax of the input document, of the first schema definition (Chandler: see [0038]).

**Referring to claim 12**, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the method according to Claim 32, wherein the identification of the first schema definition in the input document uses a schema location construct in the input document (Chandler: see [0038]).

**Referring to claim 13**, Bogdan discloses a computer-implemented method of casting objects, comprising:

providing a validating parser [XML parser] that is adapted for validating whether syntax elements of an input document conform to a first schema [extended schema] definition while generating output objects, from the validated syntax elements of the input document, that conform to a second schema definition dynamically selected by a consuming application of the generated output objects [manner defined by the application] (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44);

using the validating parser for validating whether the syntax elements of the input document conform to the first schema definition, wherein:

the first schema definition is an extended schema [extended schema] (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44);

using the validating parser, responsive to the validating of the syntax elements, for generating the output objects to conform to the second schema definition, wherein:

the second schema definition is a base schema [base UI hierarchy] from which the extended schema was extended, such that the extended schema defines at least

one syntax element that is not defined in the base schema (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44); and

providing the generated output objects, by the validating parser, for use by the consuming application program (column 3, lines 27-42).

Bogdan fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document. Chandler discloses using, by a validating parser, a first syntax level for validating syntax elements when parsing syntax of an input document [the entire document is validated] (see [0037]), including the further limitation wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document (see [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the method of Chandler for identifying the syntax level with the input document of Bogdan. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase efficiency by providing only necessary elements to the application through the use of an identified syntax level, thereby decreasing the amount of information received by the application.

While the combination of Bogdan and Chandler (hereafter Bogdan/Chandler) discloses application specific generation of objects (Bogdan: see column 3, lines 27-42), Bogdan/Chandler fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of the generating further comprises not generating any output object for any of the at least one syntax element that is defined in the extended schema but not defined in the base schema in order that the generated output objects will conform to the second schema definition. Slaughter

discloses the concept of a space containing a base schema and a plurality of schema extensions, including the further limitation of the generating further comprises not generating any output object for any of the at least one syntax element that is defined in the extended schema but not defined in the base schema in order that the generated output objects will conform to the second schema definition (see column 45, lines 4-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the limiting feature of Slaughter in order to limit the output of Bogdan/Chandler to contain only objects that conform to the base schema. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide different levels of service to different clients depending on the client's authentication.

**Referring to claim 20**, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the method according to Claim 13, wherein: an intermediate schema definition extends the base schema by adding at least one syntax element not defined in the base schema; and the first schema definition extends the intermediate schema definition by adding at least one syntax element not defined in the intermediate schema definition; and the generating further comprises not generating any output object for any of the at least one syntax element that is defined in the intermediate schema but not in the base schema (Bogdan: see column 11, lines 18-44).

**Referring to claim 31**, Bogdan discloses a computer-implemented method of providing validation and parsing for clients, comprising steps of:

providing a validating parser [XML parser] adapted for validating an input document according to a first schema definition while generating output, from the

validated input document, according to a second schema definition dynamically selected by a consuming application of the generated output (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44 and column 3, lines 27-42);

validating syntax elements of the input document with the provided validating parser according to the first schema definition, wherein the first schema definition is an extended schema which specifies a syntax definition to which the syntax elements of the input document are to adhere (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44); and each of the suppressed syntax elements is valid according to the extended schema but is not valid according to the base schema see (column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44).

Bogdan fails to explicitly disclose the further limitations wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document. Chandler discloses using, by a validating parser, a first syntax level for validating syntax elements when parsing syntax of an input document [the entire document is validated] (see [0037]), including the further limitations wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document (see [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the method of Chandler for identifying the syntax level with the input document of Bogdan. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase efficiency by providing only necessary elements to the application through the use of an identified syntax level, thereby decreasing the amount of information received by the application.

While Bogdan/Chandler discloses application specific generation of objects (Bogdan: see column 3, lines 27-42), Bogdan/Chandler fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of responsive to the validating of the syntax elements, parsing the validated syntax elements to generate the output for the consuming application according to the second schema definition, wherein the second schema definition is a base schema from which the extended schema was extended, thereby suppressing at least one of the validated syntax elements when generating the output for the consuming application. Slaughter discloses the concept of a space containing a base schema and a plurality of schema extensions, including the further limitation of responsive to the validating of the syntax elements, parsing the validated syntax elements to generate the output for the consuming application according to the second schema definition, wherein the second schema definition is a base schema from which the extended schema was extended, thereby suppressing at least one of the validated syntax elements when generating the output for the consuming application (see column 45, lines 4-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the limiting feature of Slaughter in order to limit the output of Bogdan/Chandler to contain only objects that conform to the base schema. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide different levels of service to different clients depending on the client's authentication.

**Referring to claim 32**, Bogdan discloses a computer-implemented method of applying abstraction by a validating parser, comprising steps of:

using, by a validating parser, a first schema definition syntax level for validating syntax elements when parsing syntax of an input document (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44); and

the first schema definition is an extended schema (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44); and

the second schema definition is a base schema from which the extended schema is extended, such that the extended schema defines at least one syntax element that is not defined in the base schema (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44).

Bogdan fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document. Chandler discloses using, by a validating parser, a first syntax level for validating syntax elements when parsing syntax of an input document [the entire document is validated] (see [0037]), including the further limitation wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document (see [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the method of Chandler for identifying the syntax level with the input document of Bogdan. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase efficiency by providing only necessary elements to the application through the use of an identified syntax level, thereby decreasing the amount of information received by the application.

While Bogdan/Chandler discloses application specific generation of objects (Bogdan: see column 3, lines 27-42), Bogdan/Chandler fails to explicitly disclose the

further limitation of omitting, by the validating parser when generating output from the parsed syntax of the input document, each of at least one of the validated syntax elements which is valid according to the first schema definition but is not valid according to a second schema definition for which the output is generated. Slaughter discloses the concept of a space containing a base schema and a plurality of schema extensions, including the further limitation of omitting, by the validating parser when generating output from the parsed syntax of the input document, each of at least one of the validated syntax elements which is valid according to the first schema definition but is not valid according to a second schema definition for which the output is generated (see column 45, lines 4-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the limiting feature of Slaughter in order to limit the output of Bogdan/Chandler to contain only objects that conform to the base schema. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide different levels of service to different clients depending on the client's authentication.

**Referring to claim 33**, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses method according to Claim 32, wherein the second syntax level schema definition is dynamically requested, to the validating parser, by an application program for which the output is being generated (Bogdan: see column 3, lines 27-42).

**Referring to claim 34**, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the computer-implemented method according to Claim 31, wherein: an intermediate schema definition extends the base schema by adding at least one syntax element not defined in the base

schema; and the first schema definition extends the intermediate schema definition by adding at least one syntax element not defined in the intermediate schema definition; and the suppressing also suppresses each syntax element that is valid according to the intermediate schema but which is not valid according to the base schema (Bogdan: see column 11, lines 18-44).

**Referring to claim 35**, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the computer-implemented method according to Claim 32, wherein: an intermediate schema definition extends the base schema by adding at least one syntax element not defined in the base schema; and the first schema definition extends the intermediate schema definition by adding at least one syntax element not defined in the intermediate schema definition; and the omitting also omits each syntax element that is valid according to the intermediate schema but which is not valid according to the base schema (Bogdan: see column 11, lines 18-44).

**Referring to claim 36**, Bogdan discloses a system for applying abstraction by a validating parser, comprising steps of:

a validating parser usable by a computer; and

instructions which are executable, using a processor of the computer, to perform:

using, by a validating parser, a first schema definition syntax level for validating syntax elements when parsing syntax of an input document (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44); and

the first schema definition is an extended schema (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44); and

the second schema definition is a base schema from which the extended schema is extended, such that the extended schema defines at least one syntax element that is not defined in the base schema (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44).

Bogdan fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document. Chandler discloses using, by a validating parser, a first syntax level for validating syntax elements when parsing syntax of an input document [the entire document is validated] (see [0037]), including the further limitation wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document (see [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the method of Chandler for identifying the syntax level with the input document of Bogdan. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase efficiency by providing only necessary elements to the application through the use of an identified syntax level, thereby decreasing the amount of information received by the application.

While Bogdan/Chandler discloses application specific generation of objects (Bogdan: see column 3, lines 27-42), Bogdan/Chandler fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of omitting, by the validating parser when generating output from the parsed syntax of the input document, each of at least one of the validated syntax elements which is valid according to the first schema definition but is not valid according to a second schema definition for which the output is generated. Slaughter discloses

the concept of a space containing a base schema and a plurality of schema extensions, including the further limitation of omitting, by the validating parser when generating output from the parsed syntax of the input document, each of at least one of the validated syntax elements which is valid according to the first schema definition but is not valid according to a second schema definition for which the output is generated (see column 45, lines 4-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the limiting feature of Slaughter in order to limit the output of Bogdan/Chandler to contain only objects that conform to the base schema. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide different levels of service to different clients depending on the client's authentication.

**Referring to claim 37**, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses system according to Claim 36, wherein the second syntax level schema definition is dynamically requested, to the validating parser, by an application program for which the output is being generated (Bogdan: see column 3, lines 27-42).

**Referring to claim 38**, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the system according to Claim 36, wherein: an intermediate schema definition extends the base schema by adding at least one syntax element not defined in the base schema; and the first schema definition extends the intermediate schema definition by adding at least one syntax element not defined in the intermediate schema definition; and the omitting also omits each validated syntax element that is valid according to the intermediate

schema but which is not valid according to the base schema (Bogdan: see column 11, lines 18-44).

**Referring to claim 39**, Bogdan discloses a computer program product for applying abstraction by a validating parser, the computer program product embodied on at least one computer-readable medium and comprising computer-readable program code for:

using, by a validating parser, a first schema definition syntax level for validating syntax elements when parsing syntax of an input document (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44); and

the first schema definition is an extended schema (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44); and

the second schema definition is a base schema from which the extended schema is extended, such that the extended schema defines at least one syntax element that is not defined in the base schema (see column 2, line 56 – column 3, line 44).

Bogdan fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document. Chandler discloses using, by a validating parser, a first syntax level for validating syntax elements when parsing syntax of an input document [the entire document is validated] (see [0037]), including the further limitation wherein the first schema definition is identified in the input document (see [0037]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the method of Chandler for identifying the syntax level with the input

document of Bogdan. One would have been motivated to do so in order to increase efficiency by providing only necessary elements to the application through the use of an identified syntax level, thereby decreasing the amount of information received by the application.

While Bogdan/Chandler discloses application specific generation of objects (Bogdan: see column 3, lines 27-42), Bogdan/Chandler fails to explicitly disclose the further limitation of omitting, by the validating parser when generating output from the parsed syntax of the input document, each of at least one of the validated syntax elements which is valid according to the first schema definition but is not valid according to a second schema definition for which the output is generated. Slaughter discloses the concept of a space containing a base schema and a plurality of schema extensions, including the further limitation of omitting, by the validating parser when generating output from the parsed syntax of the input document, each of at least one of the validated syntax elements which is valid according to the first schema definition but is not valid according to a second schema definition for which the output is generated (see column 45, lines 4-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the limiting feature of Slaughter in order to limit the output of Bogdan/Chandler to contain only objects that conform to the base schema. One would have been motivated to do so in order to provide different levels of service to different clients depending on the client's authentication.

**Referring to claim 40**, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the computer program product according to Claim 39, wherein the second syntax level schema definition is dynamically requested, to the validating parser, by an application program for which the output is being generated (Bogdan: see column 3, lines 27-42).

**Referring to claim 41**, Bogdan/Chandler/Slaughter discloses the computer program product according to Claim 39, wherein: an intermediate schema definition extends the base schema by adding at least one syntax element not defined in the base schema; and the first schema definition extends the intermediate schema definition by adding at least one syntax element not defined in the intermediate schema definition; and the omitting also omits each validated syntax element that is valid according to the intermediate schema but which is not valid according to the base schema (Bogdan: see column 11, lines 18-44).

### ***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments filed in regards to the prior art rejections have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

11. Referring to Applicant's arguments on pages 13 and 14 of the Remarks in regards to the rejection of claim 13, the Applicants states that the examiner failed to give citations for certain limitations.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Each of the certain limitations comprise of further limitations where citations are given. Each of these citations also apply to the main limitation which comprises of these more detailed limitations.

12. Referring to Applicant's arguments on pages 14-18 in regards to the rejection of claim 13, the Applicant argues that Slaughter fails to teach the limitation of limitation of "... generating further comprises not generating ..."

The examiner respectfully disagrees. Slaughter discloses the concept of providing different levels of service to different clients depending on client authentication (see column 46, lines 16-18). Therefore, if the client can not handle certain features provided by the extended schema, the base schema is utilized to generate an output for that user and the objects in the extended schema are not generated for that user.

13. Referring to Applicant's arguments on pages 18-19 in regards to claim 20, the Applicant argues that since the examiner stated that Bogdan fails to teach the limitation of not generating in claim 13, Bogdan cannot teach the limitation of claim 20.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner states that Bogdan fails to teach the limitation of not generating according to an extended schema which is different than not generating for an intermediate schema.

14. The rejections of the claims have been maintained for the reasons stated above.

### ***Conclusion***

15. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KIMBERLY LOVEL whose telephone number is (571)272-2750. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/John R. Cottingham/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2167

/Kimberly Lovel/  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2167

20 June 2009  
/KL/